

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 21:38:45 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #224
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 12 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 224

Today's Topics:

 Brilliant postings (2 msgs)
 cw usage
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license... (2 msgs)
 Help W/Novice Ticket Stuff!!
 machine-generated CW?? (2 msgs)
 machine-generated cw [long]
 The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 20:23:16 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!alberta!nebulus!adec23!
mark@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Brilliant postings
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman KE4ZV) proclaims:
>>>Morse remains in use by a few amateurs at HF

> How can I take the rest of your postings seriously when you say
>stuff like this? A few?? You don't listen in the CW bands very much,
>do you?

Here Here!!!!

A few, kind of trivializes it Gary doesn't it! I'd say 'half' way before I'd say few ... [My guess is about 30% of the active amateurs in the world use CW. I would also say that only 5% of the Amateurs in the world are 'active' amateurs. These statistics are made up, but are closer to the mark than Gary's guess!]

Ciao -- 73 de VE6MGS/Mark -sk-

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 15:23:21 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Brilliant postings
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Will
> s) writes:

>>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman KE4ZV) proclaims:

>>

>>>>Morse remains in use by a few amateurs at HF

>>

>> A few? Well, lessee, there's a guy over in El Paso who uses
>>it, and I hear tell that there are a couple of 'em in Dallas too.
>>Mebbe even some old feller over Houston way.

>>

>> How can I take the rest of your postings seriously when you say
>>stuff like this? A few?? You don't listen in the CW bands very much,
>>do you? That is your choice, but just because I don't like phone
>>operation very much I wouldn't say that "a few amateurs" use phone.

>

> Manual Morse is now very much a specialty mode. During the debate
> leading up to the No Code license, I posed the question to a meeting
> of a local general interest ham club. I asked everyone who had made
> an amateur contact in the last 24 hours to stand. About 100 people
> stood, nearly everyone present. I then asked that only those who'd
> made an HF contact remain standing. The number dropped to about
> 30. Then I asked that only those who had used Morse for the contact
> remain standing. There were 3 people left standing. That meets my
> definition of "few". Note that all these people were coded licensees.
> Things may be even more lopsided today, or not. I'm sure I'd have
> gotten different proportions if I'd asked the question at the
> Southeastern DXers meeting, or at a packet LAN meeting. My admittedly
> unscientific band survey of 20 meters a couple of months ago showed
> 12% of the signals present were using Morse encoding.

>

> Try doing a survey of *your* club at the next meeting.
>
> Gary

Problem with your little informal survey is the fact that the club is comprised mostly of members who use 2m and 70cm regularly. Of course they're not going to make as many CW contacts. Try doing a survey with valid data next time.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
         /|    \_/
        / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
 *    || { } ||
      || { } || (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
      ||-----||
      ^^      ^^
-----
```

Date: 12 Jul 1993 15:31:15 -0500
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!
emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: cw usage
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) replies:

>>My admittedly unscientific band survey of 20 meters a couple of months
>>ago showed 12% of the signals present were using Morse encoding.

>>Try doing a survey of *your* club at the next meeting.

Hmm, well, I belong to the university club here and there are only 2-3 serious users of the station, all of whom use CW almost exclusively, so I'd have to say that about 100% of the users prefer CW! I don't belong to any other local clubs, but I do support the Northern California DX Foundation, and I bet you that the majority of those members use CW, likewise the Lone Star DX Association, which I am probably about to join.

This is also an unscientific survey... but if you look at the statistics of DXpeditions, you will find that the typical result

is that they make 60% of their QSOs on phone and 40% on CW. One should ask why this is (and I readily admit that not everyone is into DXing).

Perhaps your club is different, Gary. Perhaps the people who like and use CW would rather get on the air and use it than go to another boring old club meeting and participate in an unscientific survey...

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 12 Jul 93 14:45:40 EDT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!
news.crd.ge.com!sunblossom!knight.vf.ge.com!news.ge.com!psinntp!psinntp!
arrrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In <21rnfc\$6mg@mercury.king.ac.uk> ap_v132@king.ac.uk (Niall Pagdin) writes:
>
>>Here in the UK anyone who has passed their examination (and not yet got
>>their ticket) can use the station and call-sign of another licenced
>>amateur until such time as their own licence comes through. In my
>>opinion this is a good approach because it means a person who has just passed
>>their test can get a "look in" while at the same time being suitably
>>supervised (a requirement) by the amateur whose call they are using.
>
>
>This is a REALLY outstanding idea. I guess the way you could make it work
>here would be to add an extra slot on the 610 and the CSCE for an Elmer's
>callsign and signature. This would encourage interaction between new and
>old hams, solving many problems at once.

Ummm... in the US, this is already perfectly doable *without* the person first passing the exam. Note that Niall said the requirement includes supervision by the licensed operator. In the US, a licensed operator can supervise an unlicensed person's operation of an amateur station per 97.115(b).

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 17:13:56 PDT
From: rtech!amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> In <21rnfc\$6mg@mercury.king.ac.uk> ap_v132@king.ac.uk (Niall Pagdin) writes:
>
> >Here in the UK anyone who has passed their examination (and not yet got
> >their ticket) can use the station and call-sign of another licenced
> >amateur until such time as their own licence comes through. In my
> >opinion this is a good approach because it means a person who has just passe
> >their test can get a "look in" while at the same time being suitably
> >supervised (a requirement) by the amateur whose call they are using.
>
> This is a REALLY outstanding idea. I guess the way you could make it work
> here would be to add an extra slot on the 610 and the CSCE for an Elmer's
> callsign and signature. This would encourage interaction between new and
> old hams, solving many problems at once.

How does this differ from a control operator allowing someone at the xmtr?
As I interpret the rules, I can allow anyone to use my xmtr, as long as I
have control. I DO know where the off switch is.

KA6ETB

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1993 23:55:26 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Help W/Novice Ticket Stuff!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mwootton@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu (Matthew B Wootton) writes:

>
> Hi! This is my first posting to the newsgroup...
>
> I passed my novice test about two years ago (7/13/91)...I assumed that was al
> l
> I had to do to receive my novice ticket!! I never got anything back (Like a
> call sign *AHEM*) ..Did I do something wrong or miss something...?? I have my
>
> certificate of completion of the novice exam...what should I do??? Write the

> FCC ????. Please mail me as soon as possible!! Thanks a million..
>
> mwootton@acs.ohio-state.edu

Ummm... I have a question. That Certificate of Successful Completion... does it say FCC 610 on it? If so, you're holding onto the reason why you never got a callsign. First, I'd follow up with whoever administered the novice exam to you. If at that point you can verify that paperwork was sent to the FCC then you call the FCC and complain. If this turns up nothing then it's time to visit your local VE team and do the novice test again. Sorry, but thats the way it goes.

--Tony

```
-----  
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com  
         \__/  
        (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
    /|  ____ \/  
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' into the 90's  
* || {____} ||  
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
  ^^      ^^  
-----
```

Date: 12 Jul 1993 14:30:46 -0500
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!
emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: machine-generated CW??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) says:

>When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
>CW conversations going on. One must presume this is computer to computer
>communications ...

(etc)

This is an ignorant statement. What do you mean by "machine-generated CW"? Do you just mean that people are going too fast for you to copy and they must therefore be cheating by using computers? I know of very few people who use computers to send or receive CW, all I hear when I tune across the CW bands is people using paddles and keyers properly, and a few slower people using hand keys. When you want to send CW at 30+ wpm, using a paddle and keyer is quite efficient, but it's hardly using a computer. In excess of 45 wpm it may well be computer-generated, but I only hear one such QSO per band in general, not

a "couple hundred", and I know people who send by hand at 45+ wpm (not with a straight key, but with a paddle of some sort).

I can accept that you do not like to use CW or you are frustrated because you have not been able to progress beyond a few wpm, or whatever the situation is, but showing ignorance of the way in which most people use CW is not very helpful to anyone. Perhaps we should take it as a complimentary remark if you think most CW is generated by computers, it just says that people are sending decent CW.

Do you think that people who can play tennis better than you can are all using some sort of computer to do it?

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 12 Jul 1993 20:50:05 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: machine-generated CW??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:
|jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) says:
|>When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
|>CW conversations going on. One must presume this is computer to computer
|>communications ...
| This is an ignorant statement. What do you mean by "machine-generated CW"?
|Do you just mean that people are going too fast for you to copy and they must
|therefore be cheating by using computers? I know of very few people who use
|computers to send or receive CW, all I hear when I tune across the CW bands is
|people using paddles and keyers properly, and a few slower people using hand
|keys. When you want to send CW at 30+ wpm, using a paddle and keyer is quite
|efficient, but it's hardly using a computer. In excess of 45 wpm it may well
|be computer-generated, but I only hear one such QSO per band in general, not
|a "couple hundred", and I know people who send by hand at 45+ wpm (not with a
|straight key, but with a paddle of some sort).

Well, the original remark was pretty content free anyhow. Technically speaking, since the lever is one of the basic machines of physics, even a brass pounder with a straight key qualifies as using a machine to send CW. I guess only the guy sending by touching two bare wire ends together qualifies as not using a machine.

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 02:58:25 GMT
From: olivea!sgigate!odin!chuck.dallas.sgi.com!adams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: machine-generated cw [long]
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Oooooops, shouldn't have opened up this thread gang.

at speeds in excess of 40 or 45 wpm, i don't see how anyone can do it with:

- a. a J-38
- b. Bencher or other Iambic paddles with keyer
- c. Vibroplex bug
- d. any other mechanical to electronic conversion system other than a keyboard.

at one time i refused to use anything other than a Bug (which i still have in a plexiglass case - Vibroplex Deluxe Presentation Chrome jobbie with jeweled bearings....). used to hate to listen to T0 keyers, etc. then when i finally got to higher speeds i had to convert over.

sad to say i have to use the Heath Ultrapro keyboard except when at speeds under 40 wpm during FD where keyboards are considered a luxury for many reasons. also use MM3, CK2, or builtin keyer in Oak Hills QRP rig periodically to keep from getting too rusty. no way i'd punish someone with paddle at high speeds to have too many errors come down the tube. i'm bad enough at 30wpm.

now the computer issue. is the computer used to receive? if it is, then the operator is NOT doing CW! period, end of discussion. it's a no brainer. might as well be doing RTTY, AMTOR, etc. at high speeds with QRN, QRM, QSB, and all the other hazards, a computer will never do the job the human mind can do with internally. you can take all the DSPs, filtering, etc. you want and by the time you get to a job as good as a human being can do with only the human ear, you'd have a system far too expensive for use in this hobby. INHO, if you could develop such a system. i'd like to see it. maybe. :-)
i think the ultimate test would be Field Day or SweepStakes.

i know that cw is considered to be an obsolete mode by some, but hey. with that kinda attitude, the same people would probably outlaw bicycles too. bow and arrow? pencil? there are a lot of people who still enjoy these things. HEY, there are some people who still read books. it's slower than watching the movie, but infinitely more enjoyable.

i know that there are people who like to play games with other people.

they use the J38s, keyers with strange weighting, etc. to keep the individuals who do use computers for receiving confused and away from them. OK, but if your fist is so bad that it's an effort for me to copy, i'll go away. no big deal.

WA7LDV will know if i am using a keyer. you'll hear a lot of iii's which is my way of sending an error. sometimes you'll hear someone send three e's for an error. we know what you mean.

going back to using the computer. i'll talk to you anyway. probably after a while you'll start doing a better job than the computer. ;-)

i'll tell you what. come SKN (straight key night), i'll take the J-38 mounted on a stained and polished board out and get on. but i think i had better practice a few months in advance. :-) how much power is everyone running on SKN? i'll have to get the HW-16 outta mothballs too!!

now back to the regular flame wars in progress. guess this counts. :-)

see next posting by this individual.

b c n u on the bands. gl es 73 de k5fo dit dit

--

"Be not too hard for life is short and nothing is given to man." - J. Baez

Chuck Adams, K5FO - CP60
adams@sgi.com

Date: 12 Jul 93 16:08:06 GMT
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@sun.com
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

To Code or Not To Code, *THAT* is the question! I've collected and distilled the *ENTIRE* net.wisdom on this issue and so I present the following canonical list for your elucidation. In order to conserve net.bandwidth, please search for your favorite answer and then respond by number rather than with the entire text. :-)

Brian McMinn N5PSS brian.mcminn.amd.com

- 1) No-Code is good!
- 2) No-Code is bad!

- 3) Morse Code is a separate and distinct *LANGUAGE*!
- 4) No it isn't!
- 5) Yes it is! I just talked to a guy in Upper Eeleeouglieaph yesterday. His name was Dzlaeuflinaout and that's all I know!
- 6) Everybody should know Morse Code to help intercept *SPY* messages!
- 7) Hey! Morse is my favorite mode! Don't knock it 'till you try it!
- 8) Morris Code stinks!
- 9) No it doesn't!
- 10) It's the most spectrally *efficient* mode!
- 11) No it isn't!
- 12) Code will punch through when all else fails because it has the *BEST* immunity to noise!
- 13) No way! Digital modes and DSP will pull a signal out of the noise when you can't *EVEN* hear it!
- 14) I've got better things to do with my brain cells than ask them to act like a wetware modem!
- 15) I had to learn Morse Code so *YOU* should too!
- 16) All past and current problems with ham radio are a direct result of the No-Code Technicians!
- 17) Morse Code keeps the riff-raff out of ham radio!
- 18) Toss the Code requirement and make the written test harder!
- 19) Can I order pizza in Morse Code?
- 20) I heard one of those bozo's sending Morse Code on the repeater!
- 21) If Morris Code is so good, why does it need protected band space?
- 22) The FCC says No-Code is good. So There!
- 23) I wouldn't be a ham if there wasn't a No-Code license.
- 24) GET A LIFE!
- 25) Where's my KILL file?
- 26) That's the sound of an electric hole saw warming up!
- 27) The ARRL did this to us! Blame *THEM*!
- 28) The ARRL tried their best to stop this! Blame *THEM*!
- 29) I'm going to cancel my ARRL membership over this *ONE* issue!
- 30) Hams who started with No-Code now represent 98% of all hams!
- 31) Hey! Can't you U.S. guys keep this discussion to yourselves?
- 32) You're a *#&@!^%!
- 33) Yeah? And your mother wears tennis shoes!
- 34) Oh bother, let's just give the spectrum back to the spectrum gods.
- 35) Vacuum Tubes! Yeah, now that's a great idea!
- 36) I can build a CW transceiver with only *THREE* components!
- 37) Including the *ANTENNA*!
- 38) Without Morse Code, the ham bands will be filled with *CB'ers*!
- 39) UGH!
- 40) Hey! Who're you calling a *CB'er*!
- 41) (in chorus) UGH!
- 42) Free the airwaves! Eliminate the written test!
- 43) Sigh. Another step in the &#*\$%)# incentive licensing scandal.
- 44) The QCWA supported No-Code, so it must be good!
- 45) It's a conspiracy of the {ARRL, QCWA, AMSAT, TAPR, \$\$\$\$, etc.}

46) This discussion is *BORING*!
47) *EVERYBODY* supports No-Code!
48) *EVERYBODY* hates No-Code!
49) Morse Code is a *VALUABLE* skill!
50) There's an *INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT* that forbids this!
51) But Japan doesn't abide by it!
52) Morse Code -- it's *DIVINE*!
53) *FLAMETHROWERS ON HIGH*!
54) Go ahead, I've got my asbestos underwear on!
55) Ya feel lucky, Punk? Huh? Go ahead, make my day.
56) Take this discussion to r.r.a.policy!
57) But what if you're in an airplane crash and the mike breaks?
 THEN you'll wish you knew the code!
58) There is an inverse relationship between code speed and IQ!

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 20:42:05 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!alberta!nebulus!adec23!
mark@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>,
<1993Jul11.212512.24067@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <!gtxl7@dixie.com>
Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

jgd@dixie.com (John Dixie Armond) writes:

>And Jay seems to have little scruples against anything that can be done with
>the mouth.

And John seems to have little scruples against Ad Hom attacks ...

>When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
>CW conversations going on.

The expert speaks!

I counter, by trying to find a real QSO occurring on phone, rather than the
proliferation of one-way QSOs ... I could simulate most of the phone QSOs
using a 'brag tape' ...

>Gary's use of the word "few" was quite accurate.

Gary, do you like being defended by John? Certainly adds credibility! Leave it
to John to make a statement trivializing another point of view (a common,
and often acceptable practice used in arguments), and twist it into a 'fact'.

Now getting back on track, how many of you feel that incentive licensing is good because:

- a) it allows Americans to have a petty squabble about 'mode' wars
- b) it give Canadians great enjoyment watching childish justifications
- c) if we printed the justifications and Ad Hom attacks, it would make great TP.
- d) if the Americans had to suffer through it, then the rest of us have to ...
- e) it keeps the CBers out.

Ciao -- 73 de VE6MGS/Mark

Canada added incentive licensing three years ago, by providing 80 and 160M for 5WPM and everything else on HF for 12WPM.

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 15:25:08 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>,
<1993Jul11.212512.24067@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <!gtxl7@dixie.com>

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:

>>Gary has few scruples against hauling off and making completely unfounded
>>statements of fact, based entirely on how he would like the world to be,
>>rather than how it is...
>
> And Jay seems to have little scruples against anything that can be done with
> the mouth. Particularly when it comes to Morris.
>
> When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
> CW conversations going on. One must presume this is computer to computer
> communications using an archaic signalling method only because it is
> mandated by equally archaic law. Interspersed amongst this stuff are
> a few obviously hand-generated signals. Gary's use of the word "few"
> was quite accurate.
>
> Hey Jay. If you think old Morris is so popular, why don't you agree with
> us to deregulate it and let it sink or swim on its own merits. That it must
> have gov't protection tells me it is dead but the body just hasn't been
> buried yet.

Oh geez, I should've known we'd hear from the dipwad of Usenet, John De Armond.

First of all, those 'machine' generated CW contacts are more than likely people using iambic keyers, paddles etc. I know when I'm using the bencher I can fly on the code and it doesn't sound like someone pounding brass. I've also spoken to quite a few stations using straight keys.. matter of fact got a QSL card from one today, KD6LLA was using a Heath HW-8 at 2W into a 40m dipole up 20 feet. 400 Miles away I could hear him. If he were running ssb at that power level you wouldn't hear squat.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
         /|    \
        / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
 *   || { } ||
    ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
    ^^        ^^
-----
```

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1993 23:52:45 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <24.794.2805.0NB2962E@pcohio.com>,
<1993Jul11.054430.6530@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<1993Jul11.205344.11633@Csl.Stanford.EDU>maly.
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk (Really, the semiannual CW war)

paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> Gack. Do we really need to go over this issue every three months?

Has it been three months already? And here I was tonight, just clearing a whole bunch of stuff out of my kill file. :)

--Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
         /|    \
        / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' into the 90's
    ||-----||
    ^^        ^^
-----
```

* ||{__}||
||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
^^ ^^

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #224
